

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 10-18, 20 and 21 were pending in the application. The Examiner allowed claims 11-18, while rejecting claims 1-8, 10, 20 and 21. By this Amendment, various claims have been amended and claim 2 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1, 3-8, 10-18, 20 and 21 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS AND REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to certain claims and rejects other claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Therefore, it is submitted that the claims, as amended, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

On pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 11-18 are allowable over the prior art and that claims 2-4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and in independent form.

By this Amendment, claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form as amended claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that amended claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance. In addition, it is submitted that claims 3-8, which depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, should also be in condition for allowance.

With respect to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance on pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the applicants have the following comments.

With respect to claim 11, the Examiner paraphrases the claim language and further states that the first fixture fixes "only said boss." It is noted that in the prior Amendment the word "only" was removed from claim 11. It is believed that the applicants' incorrect quotation of the claim language of claim 11 on page 8 of the prior Amendment may have caused confusion. Therefore, applicants want to clarify that claim 11 does not include the word "only".

It is also noted that the Examiner's Statement on pages 7 and 8 paraphrases the claim language instead of quoting the claim language. For example, the claims do not employ the

terminology "steps". It is submitted that the claim language itself provides the best evidence of what is included in the claims.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 21

On pages 4-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 as anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,705,369 to Humpal or U.S. Patent 5,867,512 to Sacher.

Claim 21, as amended, is directed to a mirror fixing method which includes:

- forming a fixture with an opening capable of receiving the boss;
- providing the fixture with a hole extending through a side wall of the opening;
- fixing the boss which is received in the opening with a fastener using the hole, so that the base plate and the mirror are not in contact with other members;

That is, claim 21 has been amended to recite features similar to prior claim 2 in a broader manner. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 21, as amended, patently distinguishes over the prior art.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-9-05

By: 
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501